

REMARKS

Claims 2-8, and amended claims 1 and 9-11 are in this application.

Claim 11 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. In explaining this rejection, the Examiner stated that the statement "each said projection screen . . ." is confusing.

It is respectfully submitted that such portion of claim 11 is not confusing. With regard thereto, reference is made to lines 11-18 of page 26 of the present application. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the above 112 rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 1-7 and 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over JP 3-106298 in view of U.S. 2,632,055 (Parker).

Amended independent claim 1 now recites in part the following:

"means for causing the sound waves from the plurality of speaker units accommodated in the plurality of cabinets to be radiated therefrom in a plurality of different directions such that a main axis of directivity of the sound waves from one or more of the speaker units associated with a first channel is in a first direction, the main axis of directivity of the sound waves from one or more of the speaker units associated with a second channel is in a second direction which is different from the first direction, and the main axis of directivity of the sound waves from one or more of the speaker units associated with a third channel is in a third direction which is different from the first direction and the second direction;" (Emphasis added.)

It is respectfully submitted that the above features of claim 1 are described in the present application. As an example, reference is made to line 14 of page 20 to line 17 of page 21 and Fig. 10 of the present application.

It is respectfully submitted that JP3-106298 (hereinafter, the '298 patent) and Parker as applied by the Examiner do not appear to disclose the above features of claim 1.

Accordingly, for at least the above reasons, it is respectfully submitted that the above 103 rejection of claim 1 be withdrawn. For reasons similar to or somewhat similar to those previously described with regard to claim 1, it is also respectfully submitted that the above 103 rejection of claim 11 be withdrawn.

Claims 2-7 are dependent from amended independent claim 1. As such, it is respectfully submitted that the above 103 rejection of claim 2-7 be withdrawn.

Claim 8 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over patent '298 in view of Parker as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of JP 5-199576 A.

Claim 8 is dependent from amended independent claim 1. As such, it is respectfully submitted that claim 8 is distinguishable from the '298 patent as applied by the Examiner for at least the reasons previously described. The Examiner does not appear to have relied on JP 5-199576 (the '576 patent) for overcoming the above-described deficiencies of the '298 patent. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the above 103 rejection of claim 2-7 be withdrawn.

Claims 8-10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over patent '298 in view of Parker as applied to claims 1 and 6 above, and further in view of JP 5-244550 A.

Claims 8-10 are dependent from amended independent claim 1. As such, it is respectfully submitted that claims 8-10 are distinguishable from the '298 patent and Parker as applied by the Examiner for at least the reasons previously described. As best understood, the Examiner does not appear to have relied on JP 5-244550 A (the '550 patent) for overcoming the specific deficiencies of the '298 patent and Parker which were described above. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the above 103 rejection of claims 8-10 be withdrawn.

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the outstanding rejections of the claims and to pass this application to issue. If, however, for any reason the Examiner does not believe that such action can be taken at this time, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone applicant's attorney at (908) 654-5000 in order to overcome any additional rejections and/or objections which the Examiner might have.

If there are any charges in connection with this requested amendment, the Examiner is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 12-1095 therefor.

Dated: June 27, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Dennis M. Smid, Esq.

Registration No.: 34,930
LERNER, DAVID, LITTENBERG,
KRUMHOLZ & MENTLIK, LLP
600 South Avenue West
Westfield, New Jersey 07090
(908) 654-5000
Attorney for Applicant

891930_1.DOC